

21 4
0m7

63. (new) The method of claim 25, wherein the step of steganographically decoding independent information into the carrier signal causes an imperceptible change in the carrier signal.--

REMARKS

Applicant has amended claims 25, 29, and 43 in order to more particularly point out and distinctly claim that which Applicant regards as the invention. Applicant has added new claims 62 and 63. No new matter is introduced by these amendments, and these amendments are fully supported by the specification. Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner enter these amendments and reconsider the present application in view of the foregoing amendments and the following remarks.

Applicant notes, with appreciation, the interview granted to Applicant's representative by Examiner Meislahn and Examiner Swann on June 27, 2000. During the interview, Applicant's representative argued that the art cited by the Examiner did not disclose or suggest that use of "steganographically" encoding or decoding, as that term is defined throughout the specification of the present application. Applicant's representative also pointed out several places in the specification where "steganography" is defined, and submitted that one reading the application would be put on notice as to the scope of Applicant's claims.

Although no agreement was reached, the Examiner agreed to reconsider the arguments and amendments filed by Applicant on May 12, 2000.

Further, Applicant has added new claims 62 and 63, which recite that the step of steganographically encoding or decoding independent information into the carrier signal causes an imperceptible change in the carrier signal. As none of the art cited by the Examiner discusses imperceptible changes, Applicant maintains that these claims are allowable.

Applicant incorporates, by reference, the remarks submitted in the Response filed May 12, 2000.

In addition, in the Office Action mailed February 25, 2000, the Examiner stated that "[t]he references which were not cited are no longer with the parent case." Office Action, Page 2. Applicant is interpreting this statement as a response to a request made in the Response filed December 7, 1999, where Applicant requested that the Examiner consider the article

"Principles of Digital Audio" by Ken C. Pohlman. See Response filed December 7, 1999, at 12. For the Examiner's convenience, Applicant is enclosing another copy of this reference, and requests that the Examiner consider this reference, and note his consideration by initialing page 2 of the already-submitted 1449, and to provide a copy of the initialed copy to Applicant.

CONCLUSION

Applicant respectfully submits that this application is in condition for allowance, and such disposition is earnestly solicited. If the Examiner believes that an interview with Applicant's representative, either by telephone or in person, would further prosecution of this application, we would welcome the opportunity for such an interview.

Respectfully submitted,

BAKER & BOTTS, L.L.P.

Dated: July 25, 2000

By:


Robert A. King
Registration No. 42,738

Baker Botts L.L.P.
1299 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20004-2400
(202) 639-7700 (telephone)
(202) 639-7890 (facsimile)
FBC/RAK/sdl